

Arizona Invasive Species Advisory Council

March 29, 2006 12:30p.m. - 4:00p.m.

**Arizona Game and Fish Department – Roadrunner Room
2221 West Greenway Road, Phoenix**

MEETING NOTES

Tom McMahon called the meeting to order at 12:30pm. A brief welcome statement was made by Larry Riley, who noted that Director Duane Shroufe (Co-chair) and Director Don Butler (Co-chair) were unable to attend. Mr. Riley asked if there were any failures in the Meeting Agenda and none were noted. Mr. McMahon passed around the Sign-In sheet and Council roll call was taken. Heidi Vasiloff was introduced. Ms. Vasiloff may be contracted to produce the final document to the Governor for the Council.

The Council then was asked to accept the minutes/notes from the March 2, 2006 AISAC meeting. Jodi Latimer motioned and Carolyn Sieg seconded the acceptance of these meeting notes. In discussion, Jeff Myers asked a question in regards to the call to the public section from last meetings notes. He suggested that we strike an old term portion from the paragraph. These notes were then **unanimously approved** by the Council.

Working Groups Discussions

Leadership & Coordination

Mike Macauley led the discussion for this working group. Mr. Macauley noted that the working group went over the questionnaires to identify issues and concerns of the various entities. Mr. Macauley used the example of State Parks and asked whether they had land management authority. These online surveys looked at control, barriers, and gaps in infrastructure, funding strategies, staffing, and compliance questions. We had 43 responses. Mr. Macauley noted that the main issue might be that most agencies don't know what their authority is and all could use an education on invasive species. Mr. Riley asked questions concerning who responded; federal, state, private, tribal entities?? Mr. Macauley noted that they all did, but with over 200 sent out, only about 20% responded and only 1 by mail.

Mr. Macauley noted that a spreadsheet (which will be emailed to everyone) has been completed. Bill Werner stated that not all information has been completed and placed into this spreadsheet. Mr. Riley asked if there were any burning issues from the respondents. Mike Macauley stated that the lack of money/funding appears to be the main problem, along with little coordination between entities and community involvement. Jeff Myers noted that that appeared to be many gaps with state coordination and really no centralized leadership. Mr. Macauley then asked if we (the Council) are going to identify or address this problem. Mr. Riley reiterated that the Council should identify key issues/concerns in our final product to the Governors office. Mr. Riley noted that it appears that the vision of the Council may have long life in an advisory role on policy for Arizona's future coordination for invasive species.

Mr. Macauley noted that the next Agenda item dealt with the Council's recommended definition of an invasive species. Mr. McMahon asked the Council if they felt it was appropriate to combine this Action Item with the Action Item under the Research & Information Management Working Group section concerning their recommended definition. A motion was brought to the floor concerning this issue. Carolyn Sieg brought the following Motion forth:

The recommended definition of an Invasive Species for purposes of this Council is – “A *species that is 1) non-native (or alien) to the ecosystem under consideration and, 2) whose introduction causes or is likely to cause economic or environmental harm or harm to human health*”. This was seconded by Ed Northam and discussion followed.

Mr. Macauley stated that the Governors Executive Order narrowly defines indigenous species/noxious weeds. How do we then word our recommended definition? Mr. Riley mentioned that we may not get absolute consensus on this and should look to other definitions and the Federal White paper for assistance. Mr. McMahon noted that this definition was from the National Invasive Species Plan from 2001. Ms. Sieg stated that her Working Group wanted to adopt this National definition. Mr. Macauley noted that this definition failed to include indigenous species. We may be spinning our wheels because there have been introduced species brought into this state that have benefited the State. Mr. Macauley further stated that invasive species concerns must be watersheds, drainages, etc. If we have a healthy watershed, we won't have growth of noxious weeds and indigenous species where they are not welcome - pinion junipers are excellent example of encroachment, same with ponderosa pine.

Ms. Sieg asked for clarification concerning noxious weeds and non-native species. Ms. Latimer stated that the definitions “challenges” (i.e. ecosystem) are apparent in all literature but there are many common words. Ms. Sieg further stated that there might be instances where native species could be termed invasive species. Ms. Latimer noted that some managers are highly challenged by the term ecosystem in this definition and can we clearly define (1/2 living organisms, 1/2 biotic). According to BLM, an eco-system is “function of nature combining biotic and abiotic environments in which they react. Furthermore....what is definition of Alien Plant? Does it include agricultural species? Heidi Vasiloff asked the Council to clarify the word “alien”. Ms. Sieg suggested the removal of the alien from this definition.

Jim Maynard discussed the example of junipers moving into another site and causing economic harm with erosion, water supply usage, increase in silt and other kinds of implications to the immediate ecosystem. Ms Latimer felt it was very important to be specific to non-natives for several reasons - Example mesquite-conditions where deemed to be invasive, but have great value economically (\$1000 box). The allowance of removal of natives under certain conditions may be plausible. Mr. Macauley suggested we take out non-native, but leave alien in the definition. Jeff Lovich added that the Rangeland science literature refers to increaser and decreaser species, but does not recall anyone in this literature calling any native species, like juniper, “invasive exotics”. Mr. Riley noted that a vast majority of the species that tend to be invasive are non-native species, plants/animals that have invasive behavior, so we may want to focus on and acknowledge non-natives as a word in the definition. Mr. Macauley further noted that some natives will produce a closed canopy where 80% of moisture rises back up into atmosphere. When enough moisture reaches the ground, it may lead to erosion, flooding, greater expense, so we might need to address native species as invasive.

Bart Worthington noted that he looked online for the definition of ecosystem and there are many that can be confusing and has similar thinking to Mr. Macauley concerning native species coming into unnatural areas. Mr. Riley stated that this discussion is very good and should it be extended beyond species. Steve Fenn stated that native species can be invasive, but let's look at what the purpose of this Council is and should the definition be somewhat general and fall into federal guidelines. Mr. Fenn believes we need to keep this definition inline of the National definition in order to gain federal funding. Ed Northam further noted that the problem of an ecosystem definition being worked out might be problematic -example: desert broom in Tonto National Forest. It is highly flammable and the broom will carry it into forest across fencelines – his point is that all entities should be addressed by locality example: –urban, roadside, etc. Bill Werner stated that we need to scale this to what it fits, which is the context of non-native species - Arizona ranges in elevation from 120' to 12,000', quite a lot of ecosystems. Glen Fahringer brought up the question of ultimately, what is our goal? Will this

definition be turned into a law? He felt that this definition was not supposed to be regulatory. Mr. Riley commented on definition of ecosystem and we may never find something that will fit. He further believes that any definition will not be regulatory in state or federal statute.

Mr. Riley continued that National Invasive Species Committee put together this definition and after many years of debate there is still a difference of opinion. There are non-natives that have value to Arizona. Plants and animals that are unwanted do come in by man and cause damage. Ms. Sieg brought up the example of our fish in Arizona reservoirs. Mr. Riley went on to state that we are walking a fine line with sport fish & native fish – the Arizona Game and Fish Department needs to conserve both to provide recreation and conserve resources. John Gerstenberger noted that PetSmart sells non-native fish and the more broad the definition the better for existing species of interest – example – gerbils in California. Mr. Riley pointed out that the definition is one thing, but how it may be interpreted later is another - could be used where not intended if too restrictive. Mr. Riley believes this Council needs to set the policy tone for Arizona and not use this as a regulatory condition.

Dr. Lovich suggested we look at why the Governor tasked us to do this and why the Executive Order was produced. We should be focusing on fulfilling this EO - it is loose for a reason. Mr. Fahringer asked to accept the definition as is. Mr. Riley suggested we look closely at the federal White Paper for the National Plan, recognizing locality, for further refinement and explanation of what an invasive species means. Mr. Macauley used tamarisk as an example of stream bank eroding and what comes out of council can lead to legislation being passed. Mr. Fahringer believes that “alien” and “non-native” are not the same word, but Mr. Macauley believes that they are generally the same. Chris Trask stated that everything being discussed are guidelines, not law or regulations. Mr. Gerstenberger stated that he noted the word “control” is being used a lot and suggested that the definition in non – native be changed to “uncontrolled”. Dr. Lovich stated that Arizona has nothing that different in respect to other states and the National Plan - Is there something unique to AZ to change this nationally accepted definition? Mr. Northam suggests usage of this White Paper and further states that some native species can behave in invasive behavior. Jim Maynard and Mr. Macauley state that we need to focus on what is best for Arizona - people are bringing in flora from all over. Ms. Vasiloff stated that if we look at Executive Order and the 10 criteria, the definition, as stated and motioned, could address all the criteria. Mr. Riley continued that our definition should be very broad. John Brock further supported the motioned definition. He believes it works well, takes care of lot of ancillary issues, and can address natives that spread.

The Motion was called to question. The Motion, as amended, is stated as:

“A species that is 1) non-native (~~or alien~~) to the ecosystem under consideration and, 2) whose introduction causes or is likely to cause economic or environmental harm or harm to human health”.

With some minor discussion, this **Motion was passed by unanimous consent.**

Mr. McMahon asked when the next meeting of this working group was scheduled to take place. Mr. Macauley stated April 6, 2006. Mr. Riley reiterated the point that we now need the working groups to produce more formal reports for the final report to the Governor – time is getting short.

Research and Information

Dr. Lovich presented a revised report from the working group – this is a clean first draft and they are looking for feedback. One recommendation is the creation of an Arizona center for invasive species. This was presented as a **formal Motion by Dr. Lovich** and seconded by Ms. Sieg. Discussion was opened by Mr. McMahon.

Dr. Lovich noted that the Council may have ownership of the concept of this “center” and there appears to be widespread support for this notion throughout the whole Council, not just this working

group. Mr. Macauley asked about the legal standing of this entity. Will it include Non-Government Entities? Mr. Riley stated that he believed it would be up to us to flush out the vision for a center. Mr. Macauley further asks if this motion passes, what is next step? Will government agencies have authority on who covers what and what authority they have? Mr. Fenn recommends that the State include all areas not covered by regulatory law. Mr. Riley asks if this center is to have a regulatory authority or just a clearinghouse? Dr. Brock states that he believes the intent of the center is public advisory, not legal or regulatory. Montana has a center of Invasive Species. Department of Interior acts as a clearinghouse and gives out grants. Dr Lovich envisions this center after a federal model - National Center is located at Ft. Collins Colorado - look at them as a coordination point and not regulatory, this Center in Colorado has a Board of Directors. Bart Worthington notes that the government created a water university (expertise on water resources) and can we draw from these types of resources. Mr. Macauley asks will center have any legal authority and include entities from this Council. Dr. Lovich and the working group envision a central clearing house. We need to further discuss goals of program; note things are not well coordinated yet. Dr. Brock uses the example of the recently created sports authority for new stadium with non-governmental involvement. Mr. Riley notes that this regional sports authority uses a special taxing district with the source of information on expertise. This center might be a government cooperative, maybe university based. Dr. Brock notes that other centers for biological invasions are too fragmented in other states. We need this one to be pulled together, such as the ability to get and give grants. Mr. Fenn states that the Control and Management was going to also recommend an Arizona center for invasive species is created as a recommendation to the Governor. Mr. Fahringer notes that the intranet would be a valuable tool and a good way of getting information to people, web based concept. Brian Moorhead supports this center to educate people and the center should include a web-based resource. Call to question by John Brock.

This Motion to recommend the creation of an Arizona center for invasive species was passed through unanimous consent

Control and Management

Bill Werner spoke for this working group and the current status of efforts by this working group, such as evaluating the online invasive species mgmt. Questionnaires. The working group is investigating and compiling what is happening in state patterns and have a new version of an outline with more meat added to the bones (handout). The question was asked, "What is role of cooperative weed management and why do they exist? The group answered that they fulfill a void and other states have a more organized structure. Mr. Werner continued that this working group has no specific recommendations as of yet. This working group has a meeting set for April 4, 11:00am to 3:00pm at the ADWR.

Jodi Latimer stated that Arizona Title 48 contains structured weed districts in Arizona state law and encouraged this working group to look more closely at it. The question was asked, "Does Title 48 work on all state land?" Ms. Latimer answered she believed it may be special to private landowners. Mr. Riley stated that we need an organized approach on dealing with this issue and Title 48 may hold a key to future needs. We should be able to further refine with assistance from all managers' land (tribal, feds, states, private landowners)

Other items discussed included

- Arizona's Heritage Data Management System – adopting similar criteria (see handout) and use as a tool to evaluate spread of invasive species;
- Gap- we use to have inspection stations, what happened?
- Outreach areas-
 1. Raising awareness to other State/Federal/Municipal agencies and;
 2. Prioritize target audience and info friendly.

- Central clearing house - make it a web based resource where people can print out what they want from web site.
- Maybe use mass media to reach beyond land management.

Anticipation and Outreach

Jodi Latimer led the discussion for this working group. They see the need for a linkage for technical and educational aspects – such as a Central Clearinghouse. Bart Worthington felt that the concept of individuals having the ability to print out their own brochures is a great idea. Mr. Worthington went on to ask if we could link this information to another program/agency? Ms. Latimer stated that we need to flush out that issue and see what the Council as a whole recommends. Mr. Riley stated that there were other resources that the working group (and the Council) should look at, specifically a copy of the HAACP (Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point) book. Ms Latimer finished the discussion with no date set for the next working group meeting.

Old Business

Mr. McMahon updated the Council on the Governor's website and stated out page was easier to find and better to use. There are also links to other state's web pages. Dr. Brock updated the group on his recent trip to Washington, D.C. for National Weed Awareness Week.

- Great PowerPoint presentation on the last year's hurricanes and their overall impacts.
- Updated group on current legislation and was able to meet with some congressman where he talked about Arizona's progress.
- Noted that US Senator Renzi was a good ally and seemed to care about what is going on.
- Many other people just uneducated about invasive species.
- Briefing sessions included one by the Army Corp of Engineers, which was great.
- Forest service talked about aerial spraying of herbicides which seemed to be inconsistent within the agency itself
- Current legislation:
 - National Noxious Weed Control act, which was passed and signed by President Bush (15 million nationally)
 - Promoting the passage of National Aquatic Invasive Species act
 - Salt Cedar Control-currently a consent item with very little objections. May pass-good for 6 southwestern states

Dr. Brock welcomed the idea of sending more people next year as he highly recommended attending this conference. Everything is cheap except for the hotel. Mr. Riley said that it was good to now about the federal legislation and Arizona needs to push to utilize federal grants. Dr. Brock said progress is being made, we just need to show that to Senator Renzi and he will continue to show his support

NEW BUSINESS

Larry Riley led discussion on the draft report outline and Larry would like feedback on the framework of this preliminary outline and the executive summary. Jeff Lovich emphasized the importance of brevity and focus and suggested that if each working group section was 3-4 pages, we may have too large a document for the Governor. Heidi Vasiloff commented on adding a section with final recommendations and using common items amongst the working groups in these recommendations, such as the Center for Invasive Species, definition, etc. Mr. Riley further stated that it is critical to start identifying terms for the glossary section in the back of the report and our working groups need to come up with a list of terms to develop this glossary list. The question was asked, "Can we use the same list as the National report". It was the general consensus that we may "borrow" a lot from this Report, but we must relate it to Arizona's situation. Ms. Vasiloff asked if there was a need for funding resources for this Center for Invasive Species. Mr. Riley stated that we first need to take a look at the functions of any Center and not the dollar figures (yet), because there are grants available to the state.

Mr. Riley further stated that within the final report we needed to add the “Ten Horribles” for invasive species. Discussion revolved around zebra mussels, New Zealand mud snail, hydrilla, water hyacinth, certain species of Asian carp, etc. Make sure they are very short stories and also have some positive examples of control/management at a reasonable expense, maybe even include some success stories as well. Bart Worthington asked how this would be presented in the report to the Governor and discussion revolved around the use of graphics, pictures, illustrations, and charts. Mike Macauley felt it was important to verbiage rather than pictures and perhaps have the pictures as part of the appendix in the back. John Brock stated that bullet points would be a great communication tool for the politicians and public. Dr. Brock further stated that we should show the map of weed management areas. Mr. Macauley asked if we should we have more than 1 recommendation or perhaps use various alternatives in our final recommendations...people like to have a choice. Mr. Riley stated that he expects expansion on all of this from the governor’s office and we should show what the economic costs associated with invasive species may be, especially with border states and boundary issues. Tom McMahon recommended a cover for the final report that will get people’s attention. It was then suggested that everyone on the Council take ownership in sending pictures to Mr. McMahon, with full disclosure of any copyrights or credit.

New Business/Parking Lot

- Copies of HACCP from USFWS for next meeting
- Do you need a strategic plan in order to get funding?
- April 20th next meeting
- Ed Northam – Funding from the Feds - take a look at what other organizations are doing better and more efficiently, because they are the ones getting the money.
- Aquatic Nuisance Species website is a great website – www.anstaskforce.gov
- Dr Brock has a PowerPoint presentation which he would more than happy to show the group concerning, “Arizona Weed and Invasive Plant Strategies.” No action taken
- Glen Fahringer - What about a list of plants? Should we make recommendations and talk about adopting for fauna also. No action taken.

Call to the Public

No input

Future Meetings

- April 20th, May 2nd, May 23rd all at the Department of Agriculture from 10am -4pm. The website will have this updated information.

Adjourned at 4:07pm